

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 15-22, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendricks et al. (hereinafter Hendricks), United States Patent 7,743,330.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable because each and every feature is not disclosed or suggested by Hendricks. Claim 1 recites:

An apparatus for providing object-in-content information, managed by an object-in-content information managing device, comprising:

a central control unit operable to receive content, supply basic content information of the content, and provide the object-in-content information in a user-viewable format; and

an object information interface unit operable to transmit a request message including the basic content information to the object-in-content information managing device, receive a response message including the object-in-content information corresponding to the basic content information from the object-in-content information managing device, and transmit the object-in-content information included in the response message to the central control unit,

wherein the received content is not received through the object-in-content information managing device.

On page 3 of the Non-Final Office Action dated June 8, 2011, the Examiner relies on the object delivery center 15 taught by Hendricks in FIG. 1 for a teaching of the claimed object-in-content information managing device. The Examiner also relies on the reception site 30 illustrated in FIG. 1 of Hendricks for a teaching of the claimed central control unit and on page 4

of the Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on the same element, the reception site 30, for a teaching of the claimed object information interface unit.

Therefore, the Examiner contends that Hendricks teaches:

an object information interface unit operable to transmit a request message including the basic content information to the object-in-content information managing device, receive a response message including the object-in-content information corresponding to the basic content information from the object-in-content information managing device, and transmit the object-in-content information included in the response message to the central control unit.

Applicants respectfully disagree. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of Hendricks and as described at column 4 lines 52-57, the reception site 30 (alleged object information interface unit) transmits a message to the interactive object servicing center 60, and not to the object delivery center 15 (alleged object-in-content information managing device), as recited in independent claim 1. Similarly, the reception site 30 (alleged object information interface unit) receives a response from the interactive object servicing center 60, and not from the object delivery center 15 (alleged object-in-content information managing device), as required in independent claim 1. Finally, Applicants respectfully note that it is not clear how the reception site 30 can simultaneously be the object information interface unit and the central control unit, as noted in the Non-Final Office Action at pages 3 and 4, for such interpretation of the reference would require that the reception site 30 receive information from the interactive object servicing center 60 or another element, and transmit that information to itself. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Hendricks fails to teach or suggest, at least, these novel features of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 7, 12, 15, 20 and 25, it is noted that these claims recite features substantially similar to the above-discussed features of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7, 12, 15, 20 and 25 are patentable at least for similar reasons as set forth above.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 8, 10, 11, 13, 16-19, 21, 22, 24, 26 and 27 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on the independent claims.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is patentable because each and every feature is not disclosed or suggested by Hendricks. Claim 2 recites:

An apparatus for providing object-in-content information of content, comprising:

a basic content information converting unit operable to receive a message including basic content information of the content and provide converted basic content information corresponding to the basic content information;

a storage unit operable to store the object-in-content information;

an information search unit operable to extract the object-in-content information stored in the storage unit by using the converted basic content information; and

an object information transmitting unit operable to generate a response message including the object-in-content information provided by the information search unit and transmit the response message to a central control unit,

wherein the object information transmitting unit does not transmit the content to the central control unit.

On page 7 of the Non-Final Office Action dated June 8, 2011, the Examiner relies on the object delivery center 15, taught by Hendricks in FIG. 1, for a teaching of the claimed storage unit. The Examiner also cites column 12, lines 41-64 of Hendricks for a teaching of an information search unit. The Examiner does not specify which element in the citation

corresponds to the information search unit, but column 12, lines 41-67 and column 13, lines 1-7 teach:

Once specific virtual objects are selected for one or more available virtual object locations 37, the groups that should view each virtual object 38 are determined, based on the target category of interest. The selected virtual object locations 37 may include all virtual object locations, or a subset of all the virtual object locations. Assignment of a reception site 30 to a group for the appropriate virtual objects may be based on a detailed retrieval plan. The retrieval plan may provide information for one virtual object location 37 or multiple virtual object locations within content 36, where one or more virtual objects, target categories, and the groups to which each virtual object 38 is targeted within each virtual object location 37 is also provided. An example retrieval plan is provided in Table C below. Alternatively, the retrieval plan providing virtual object assignments to virtual object locations may be sent independently from the retrieval plan providing virtual objects, target categories, and the groups to which each virtual object 38 may be targeted. Retrieval plans may be distributed along with the virtual objects and the associated content 36 directly to the reception sites by the delivery processor 1300 or using the object delivery center 15. Alternatively, a retrieval plan may be distributed by the delivery processor 1300 or using the object delivery center 15 independent of the associated content 36 or virtual objects.

After the reception site 30 receives and stores the virtual objects and the retrieval plan, the reception site 30 inserts those virtual objects into the appropriate virtual object locations in the content 36 based on the retrieval plan. The reception site 30 may retrieve and store only those virtual objects associated with that reception site's group assignment for that virtual object location 37. Alternatively, the reception site 30 may retrieve and store all virtual objects but only insert those virtual objects into virtual object locations as dictated by the retrieval plan.

Therefore, since the element that stores the virtual objects is the reception site 30, it is assumed that the Examiner relies on the reception site 30 for a teaching of the information search unit. However, Applicants respectfully assert that assuming that the reception site 30 were to correspond to the information search unit, Hendricks still fails to teach or suggest:

an information search unit operable to extract the object-in-content information stored in the storage unit by using the converted basic content information.

As noted above in column 12, line 65 - column 13, line 7 of Hendricks, a retrieval plan along with the virtual objects and the associated content is distributed directly to the reception site 30 using the object delivery center 15. After the reception site 30 receives and stores the virtual objects, the reception site 30 inserts those virtual objects into the appropriate virtual object locations in the content 36 based on the retrieval plan. Accordingly, assuming that the reception site 30 along with the retrieval plan and the virtual objects were the alleged information search unit operable to extract the object-in-content information, such information is extracted from the reception site itself and not from the storage unit, as recited in independent claim 2. Therefore, Hendricks at most teaches extracting object information stored in the search unit itself (reception site 30), and not in the storage unit (object delivery center 15), as recited in independent claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Hendricks fails to teach or suggest, at least, this novel feature of independent claim 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies on the independent claim.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 5, 9, 14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks (US 7,743,330) supra, and Astiz et al. (hereinafter Astiz), United States Patent 5,918,012.

Without admission as to the correctness of the Examiner's interpretation of Astiz since the Examiner does not rely upon Astiz as curing the above-noted defect of Hendricks as applied to claims 1, 2, 7, 12 and 20 from which claims 4, 5, 9, 14, and 23 depend, it is respectfully submitted that the combination fails to disclose or suggest the features of claims 4, 5, 9, 14, and 23.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas X. Rodriguez/
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269